



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/507,199

09/09/2004

Andrew James Hickman

GB 020198

4279

24737

7590

06/26/2006

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS

P.O. BOX 3001

BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER

VAUTROT, DENNIS L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2167

DATE MAILED: 06/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/507,199	Applicant(s) HICKMAN, ANDREW JAMES	
	Examiner Dennis L. Vautrot	Art Unit. 2167	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 September 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 September 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: On page 5, line 14, a "server 1" is referred to that does not exist in the drawings.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 6 and 13 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend from any other multiple dependent claim. See MPEP § 608.01(n).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-3, 8-10, and 13 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Keyes et al.** (US 2004/0204775).

5. Regarding claim 1, **Keyes et al.** teaches a method for automatically discovering web services comprising querying a known UDDI server address containing a list of web services (See page 9, paragraph [0070] "The discovery service 118 may be a web services directory or registry service such as, for example a UDDI or any other similar or different web services directory or registry."), identifying from said list suitable web services (See page 9, paragraph [0071] "The communications engine may store available web services and communications interface information pertaining to available web services in the database."), and automatically downloading at least one machine readable description of a web service (See page 9, paragraph [0072] "In this manner, the communications engine may store communications interface information and other information pertaining to each of the available web services in a table or any other data structure within the database." This makes up the machine readable description of the web service.)

6. Regarding claims 2 and 9, **Keyes et al.** teaches said method being carried out periodically by a CE device, without user interaction (See page 9, paragraph [0071] "The information related to available web services may then be automatically and periodically updated by the communications engine so that if a web service becomes available, becomes available, and/or if communications interface information relating to any available web service changes, such information may be reflected in the database for use by the communications engine in routing and scheduling communications.")

7. Regarding claims 3 and 10, **Keyes et al.** teaches said querying comprises transmitting a query in a predefined format, and said query contains a specific request, limiting the type of web service identified (See page 10, paragraph [0073] “By way of example, a user may initially interact with the system 100 via the graphical user interface to define a profile and information or content that the user wants displayed.” This limits the types of web services that are identified.)

8. Regarding claim 8, **Keyes et al.** teaches an apparatus for automatically discovering web services comprising communicating means for querying a known UDDI server address containing a list of web services (See page 9, paragraph [0070] “The discovery service 118 may be a web services directory or registry service such as, for example a UDDI or any other similar or different web services directory or registry.”), and identifying from said list suitable web services (See page 9, paragraph [0071] “The communications engine may store available web services and communications interface information pertaining to available web services in the database.”), said communicating means arranged to automatically download at least one machine readable description of a web service (See page 9, paragraph [0072] “In this manner, the communications engine may store communications interface information and other information pertaining to each of the available web services in a table or any other data structure within the database.” This makes up the machine readable description of the web service.)

9. Regarding claim 13, **Keyes et al.** teaches a user interface for displaying information and for receiving user instructions (See page 10, paragraph [0073] “The graphical user interface performs functions that enable a system user or operator to selectively view information provided by the data services and/or the data consumers, to configure communications...within the system and/or to generally interact with applications or services...”)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 4, 5, 11, 12, and 15 – 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Keyes et al.** as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of **Qian** (US 2003/0061206).

12. Regarding claims 4 and 11, **Keyes et al.** teaches a method substantially as claimed. **Keyes et al.** fails to teach said query contains a request for TV Anytime services, said query further including an element specifying a set of taxonomies to which said service must conform. However, **Qian** teaches said query contains a request for TV Anytime services (See page 3, paragraph [0037] “The

descriptor/metadata may follow some well known standards. Examples of these standards include...TV-Anytime metatadata..."); said query further including an element specifying a set of taxonomies to which said service must conform (See page 3, paragraph [0031] "Any content that does not match with the personal preference information is ignored or discarded. Those that satisfy the preference criteria or match with the personal preference information are sent to the content assembler." And see page 3, paragraph [0036] where different taxonomies relating to content format, etc are discussed.) It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of **Keyes et al.** with that of **Qian** because, as **Qian** suggests, any number of well-known standards could be used in the discovery of web services, and there is useful commercial applicability for TV-Anytime in particular with these types of CE devices. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include said query contains a request for TV Anytime services, said query further including an element specifying a set of taxonomies to which said service must conform.

13. Regarding claims 5, 12, 16, and 18, **Keyes et al.** teaches a method substantially as claimed. **Keyes et al.** fails to teach said set of taxonomies is at least one of authority name, broadcast service, genre, content format, service usage rights, table types and queryable fields. However, **Qian** teaches said set of taxonomies is at least one of authority name, broadcast service, genre, content format, service usage rights, table types and queryable fields. (See page 1, paragraph [0018] "The preferences include

contextual preferences regarding the content the user wishes to receive from the media source...favorite topics, news, sports news... The user may also provide preferences for content delivery such as time to download, desired quality of service, etc.” This is showing at least an example of genre.) It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of **Keyes et al.** with that of **Qian** because, the various types of taxonomies are related to the TV-Anytime information and as previously mentioned, the TV-Anytime information commercial uses are well known. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include said set of taxonomies is at least one of authority name, broadcast service, genre, content format, service usage rights, table types and queryable fields.

14. Regarding claims 15 and 17, **Keyes et al.** teaches a method for automatically discovering web services comprising querying a known server address containing a list of web services (See page 9, paragraph [0070] “The discovery service 118 may be a web services directory or registry service such as, for example a UDDI or any other similar or different web services directory or registry.”), identifying from said list suitable web services (See page 9, paragraph [0071] “The communications engine may store available web services and communications interface information pertaining to available web services in the database.”), and automatically downloading at least one machine readable description of a web service, said querying comprises transmitting a query in a predefined format (See page 9, paragraph [0072] “In this manner, the communications engine may store communications interface information and other information pertaining

to each of the available web services in a table or any other data structure within the database.” This makes up the machine readable description of the web service.)

Keyes et al. fails to teach specifically TV Anytime web services, and said query further including an element specifying a set of taxonomies to which said service must conform.

However, **Qian** teaches specifically TV Anytime web services (See page 3, paragraph [0037] “The descriptor/metadata may follow some well known standards. Examples of these standards include... TV-Anytime metatadata...”), said query further including an element specifying a set of taxonomies to which said service must conform. Conform. (See page 3, paragraph [0031] “Any content that does not match with the personal preference information is ignored or discarded. Those that satisfy the preference criteria or match with the personal preference information are sent to the content assembler.” And see page 3, paragraph [0036] where different taxonomies relating to content format, etc are discussed.)

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of **Keyes et al.** with that of **Qian** because, as **Qian** suggests, any number of well-known standards could be used in the discovery of web services, and there is useful commercial applicability for TV-Anytime in particular with these types of CE devices. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include

said query contains a request for TV Anytime services, said query further including an element specifying a set of taxonomies to which said service must conform.

15. Claims 6, 7, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Keyes et al.** as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of **Hillerbrand et al.** (US 2004/0054690).

16. Regarding claim 6, **Keyes et al.** teaches a method substantially as claimed. **Keyes et al.** fails to teach responding to said querying with a response comprising the list of suitable web services. However, **Hillerbrand et al.** teaches responding to said querying with a response comprising the list of suitable web services. (See page 17, paragraph [0200] "After the search is complete, the semantic broker receives the RDF search results and communicates the results to the interpretation component. The interpretation component converts the search results to a user readable format. The graphical display engine then displays the results to the user." And see page 27, paragraph [0285] "...displays a list of selectable computer resources, here in the form of web services, that may be selected by a system user for further operations...") It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of **Keyes et al.** with that of **Hillerbrand et al.** because of the need to display the results of the web services found so the user can determine if they are useful or them or not. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include

responding to said querying with a response comprising the list of suitable web services.

17. Regarding claims 7 and 14, **Keyes et al.** teaches a method substantially as claimed. **Keyes et al.** fails to teach selecting a web service from said list and communicating the selected web service to said UDDI server address. However, **Hillerbrand et al.** teaches selecting a web service from said list and communicating the selected web service to said UDDI server address. (See page 18, paragraph [0205-0206] "...discovery of best applicable web services that satisfy the criteria and parameters selected by the end user to define an instance of the execution model, execution of such execution model instance, and viewing of results of the execution. More specifically, at step 711, the various web services are registered...It should be understood... that...the preferred format for registering such web services is in a UDDI-compliant structure..." The registration consists of communication the selected web service to the UDDI server address. And see page 27, paragraph [0285] "Results of the search are displayed in field 2720 for actual selection by the user.") It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of **Keyes et al.** with that of **Hillerbrand et al.** because in order to use the web services found, the appropriate web services that are discovered using the method of **Keyes et al.** must be selected and the UDDI server address notified in order for the newly found web service to be used. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been

Art Unit: 2167

motivated to include selecting a web service from said list and communicating the selected web service to said UDDI server address.

Conclusion

18. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.


Killian (6,163,316) teaches taxonomy information regarding genres and content format as in claim 5 and 12.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dennis L. Vautrot whose telephone number is 571-272-2184. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on 571-272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Dv
20 June 2006


JOHN R. COTTINGHAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER


22 June 2006